

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 2 and 11 stand rejected, with claims 3-10 objected to in the outstanding Official Action. Claims 3, 5 and 9 have been amended and therefore claims 1-11 remain in this application.

The Examiner's acceptance of Applicant's previously submitted formal drawings is very much appreciated. Similarly, the Examiner's acknowledgment of Applicant's claim for priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document is appreciated. Finally, the Examiner's consideration of the prior art submitted with Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement is appreciated.

Claims 1, 2 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Rabe (U.S. patent 5,717,873). The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has noted in the case of *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick*, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) that "[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim."

Independent claim 1, from which claims 2 and 11 depend, requires two specific buses in the claimed data processing apparatus. The first bus couples a first master logic unit with a plurality of slave logic units so as to enable the first master logic unit to issue "a first transfer request to **any of said slave logic units**" (emphasis added). The second bus is for coupling a second master logic unit with a "subset of said plurality of slave logic units" so as to enable the second master logic unit to issue a "second transfer request to **any of the slave logic units in said subset**" (emphasis added).

Thus, in supporting the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 11, it is incumbent upon the Examiner to establish where or how Applicant's structures recited in claim 1 are shown in the Rabe

reference. However, the Examiner fails to indicate how or where each of the specified two buses of Applicant's claim 1 is shown or rendered obvious in the Rabe reference.

The Examiner cites column 4, lines 9-13, 31-33 and column 3, lines 2-5 as disclosing various portions of the subject matter of claim 1 in the Rabe reference. The column 3 reference is a portion of the summary of the Rabe invention and thus does not reference any particular figure in the issued patent. However, column 4 is a discussion of Figure 1 of the Rabe reference, and therefore Applicant will assume that the Examiner believes that the subject matter of the buses recited in claim 1 is disclosed in Figure 1 of the Rabe reference.

Figure 1 of Rabe clearly shows a first bus (PCI bus 12) and a second bus (secondary bus 18). However, Applicant's claim 1 specifies that the first bus and the second bus have specific interrelationships, i.e., the first bus "coupling a first master logic unit with a plurality of slave logic units to enable the first master logic unit to issue a first transfer request to **any of said slave logic units**" and the second bus for "coupling a second master logic with a subset of said plurality of slave logic units to enable the second master logic unit to issue a second transfer request to **any of the slave logic units in said subset.**"

The Examiner has failed to indicate how or where either of the above-recited buses in claim 1 are shown or disclosed in Figure 1 of the Rabe reference. The Examiner broadly suggests that "Rabe discloses a bridge circuit for joining a bus master (*a first master logic unit*) to a PCI bus (*a first bus*) adapted to carry information to various components of the system . . . ." However, the disclosure in Rabe relied upon by the Examiner (column 4, lines 9-13) merely states that in Rabe

"the central processor 11 is joined to a bus 12 adapted to carry information to various components of the system 10. The bus 12 is designed as a PCI bus in order to allow the transfer of data to and

from the central processor 11 at a rate faster than is possible utilizing the typical ISA or EISA buses used by the prior art.”

The Rabe reference “to carry information to various components of the system 10” does not teach or even suggest the interconnections recited in Applicant’s claim 1, i.e., the first bus coupling a first master logic unit with a plurality of slave logic units or a second bus for coupling a second master logic unit with a subset of plurality of slave logic units. How or where the Examiner believes this interrelationship or even the disclosure of a second master logic unit is disclosed in the Rabe reference is not seen and clarification is respectfully requested.

Moreover, there is no disclosure in Rabe that the first bus enables a first master logic unit to issue a first transfer request to any of the slave logic units or that the second bus allows the second master logic unit to issue a second transfer request to any of the slave logics in the subset of slave logic units. Where is this interrelationship disclosed or rendered obvious in the Rabe reference?

Because the Official Action is so vague on where Applicant’s claimed structural elements are shown in the cited Rabe reference, it is impossible for Applicant to further rebut the additional distinctions between claim 1 and the Rabe reference. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner comply with his obligation to point out where all of the limitations of Applicant’s independent claim 1 exist in the Rabe reference in order that Applicant may appreciate the Examiner’s arguments and propose a suitable rebuttal.

Accordingly, and in view of the above, any further rejection of claims 1, 2 and 11 over the Rabe reference is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 3-10 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Claims 3, 5 and 9, upon which claims 4, 6-8 and 10

MARTIN SAN JUAN  
Appl. No. 09/845,329  
March 14, 2005

depend, respectively, have been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, claims 3-10 are believed to be allowable as amended. The Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in these claims is very much appreciated.

Having responded to all objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Official Action, it is submitted that claims 1-11 are in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. In the event the Examiner is of the opinion that a brief telephone or personal interview will facilitate allowance of one or more of the above claims, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHUYE P.C.**

By: 

Stanley C. Spooner  
Reg. No. 27,393

SCS:kmm  
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201-4714  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100